object of the bill is in direct and open violation of those engagements. To show what were the leading principles and guarantees under which all the emigrant tribes in the country west of Missouri and Arkansas were induced to exchange their lands east of the Mississippi for others west, I will read a clause from the treaty made with the Cherokees in 1885. The third article of that treaty con-

"The United States hereby covenant and agree that the lands ceded to the Cherokee nation in the foregoing article shall, in no future time, without their consent, be included within the Territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory.

This exhibits the true character of the policy and principles adopted by the Government in setting apart the country west of Missouri and Arkansas as a permanent and exclusive Indian habitation. To show that there was no distinction in the principles or policy of the Government in allotting portions of the country west of Missouri and west of Arkansas to tribes emigrating from the States east of the Mississippi, I propose to read from a treaty made with the Senecas and Shawnees of Ohio, made at Lewiston in 1831, and now resident in the territory west of Missouri, a clause similar to the one I have just read from the treaty with the Cherokees. The tenth article of this treaty contains the following stipulation: "And the United States guaranty that said lands shall never be included within the limits of any State or Territory,

nor subject to the laws thereof." A similar guarantee is to be found in the treaty made with the Shawnees of Wapaghkonetta in Ohio in the same year, and in two or three other treaties made at different dates with tribes which emigrated to the territory west of

Mr. SEBASTIAN. I beg to interrupt the Senator moment. I understand him to be speaking of the trea-ties which contain in terms the stipulation that the tribe shall never be included within the boundaries of any State or Territory. That class is a small one. The Cherokees to whom he alluded are not embraced in the bill. The Shawnees of Wapaghkonetta have lost the benefit of a similar stipulation by incorporation with the Missouri band, by which they surrendered all their nationality and their treaty stipulation by the same act. Congress, a year ago, allowed them a compensation of \$60,000 or \$70,000 for the lands they were to have had under the treaty with them. The other Shawnees are not within the limits of the proposed Territory. I admit that a small tribe of Ottowas, numbering two hundred souls, and owning thirty-four thousand acres of land, still remain, and are protected by the stipulation in their treaty similar to that of the Cherokees. This obstacle, such as it is, still stands.

Mr. BELL. The honorable Senator says that the guarantee in the last treaty I referred to, made with the Shawnees of Wapaghkonetta, was abrogated. How? They were induced to give up their lands east and seil them upon certain terms, and with the same assurance upon which other Indians gave up their lands east, namely, that they should have a permanent home in the country to which they agreed to remove, and that theirnew home should never be included within the boundaries of any State or Territory. They were to have an allotment of land out of the lands ceded to the Shawnees of Missouri in 1825, or, if they were not satisfied with that arrangement, they were to have other lands, in the same country, west of the Missouri; but they agreed with their kinsmen to live in common with them on their lands, and set up a claim upon the Government for the value of the lands they were promised in the treaty, and their claim was allowed. How does that deprive them of the protection of the guarantee that they should never be surrounded with a white population, relying upon which they ceded their lands in Ohio? By no technical, by no ingenious interpretations can the Government avoid the obligation entered into with them.

But my friend reminds me that the Cherokees do not reside in the territory embraced in this bill. I did not pretend that they do. I read a clause from the treaty with them to show the principles upon which the policy of the Indian removal was adopted by the Government in 1830; and I read clauses from the treaties made with the Shawnees of Wapaghkonetta, in Ohio, and one made in the same year with the Senecas and Shawnees of the same State; and I referred to others to show that there was no differ ence recognised by the Government as to the terms and conditions upon which the Indians were removed between the country west of Arkansas and that west of Missouri Any treaty made with a tribe which took an allotment of land west of Missouri, with a similar guarantee against the establishment of a State or Territory including their lands, and that treaty, ratified by the Senate, fixed the destination of that country. It was to be Indian territory and no other as long as a single tribe existed which emi grated to it under that guarantee. That was its destination, as understood by the Senate and the Executive, when the treaty was made with the Shawnees of Wapaghkonetta, with the Senecas and Shawnees of Lewiston, and with the Ottowas and the two other tribes which emigrated to the territory west of the Missouri; and whether one of those treaties has been abrogated or not, or whe-ther one or more of the tribes treated with upon the same terms happens to be included within the boundaries specified in this bill or not, is not material; they emigrated to the territory west of Missouri, and now reside there.

My argument is, that all the emigrant tribes which removed after 1830 were induced to remove under the same assurances and guarantees, whether specifically stated in with them or not; and that it would the treaties made be a fraud upon the Indians to give a different interpretation to the obligations of the Government. The nature and extent of the obligations contracted with the Indian tribes which emigrated to the country west of Missouri and Arkansas, in conformity with the policy of Indian removal adopted in 1830, and the proper interpretation and construction of those obligations, will be best explained by referring to what was said upon the subject by a man who was the chief and most responsible actor in all that relates both to the adoption and execution of that policy. In the message of the President of the Unit-[General Jackson] to Congress in 1835 we find the following passages connected with this subject :

"The plan of removing the aboriginal people who yet re-main within the settled portion of the United States to the country west of the Mississippi river approaches its consum-

All preceding experiments for the improvement of the In dians have failed. It seems now to be an established fact that they cannot live in contact with a civilized community and The necessary measures for their political advancement,

and for their separation from our citizens, have not been ne-glected. The pledge of the United States has been given by Congress that the country destined for the residence of this people shall be forever 'secured and guarantied to them.'
"A country west of Missouri and Arkansas has been assigned to them, into which the white settlements are not to pushed. No political communities can be formed in that extensive region, except those which are established by the Indians themselves, or by the United States for them and with their concurrence. A barrier has been raised for their pro-tection against the encroachments of our citizens, and guarding them, as far as possible, from those evils which have brought them to their present condition."

Mr. President, I must be allowed to feel more than a common sensibility to any violation of the obligations of the Government contracted with the Indian tribes. When this whole subject of Indian rights and Indian wrongs was brought to the notice of the country and thoroughly discussed—our relations with them claiming to be the guardian of these children of the forest, and they looking up to the President as their Great Father-I was chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House of Representatives, and had to bear my full share of resibility in sustaining the policy of Indian removal against the attacks of its opponents.

I have always differed from my friend from Texas (Mr. Houston) and others, who have maintained that the Indian race is susceptible of as high a development of their mental faculties as the white race, and that all their misfortunes are to be attributed to the encroachments of the white man upon their lands. I have never been so hopeful of the results of the experiments which are making to civilize and elevate their condition. I have always held the opinion that all the Government can do for them, any plan which may be adopted to wean them from their ancient habits, and to induce them to cultivate the arts of civilized life, will have no other result than to postpone the period of their final extinction ; and that, in the mean time, imbecility, despondency, and indolence will be their characteristic traits. I believe that the highest development of Indian character is only to be found in their normal or primitive condition, and before their proud spirit has been bowed by conquest.

But, sir, the question is not now whether we can ele-vate and improve the condition of the Indian tribes by encouraging them to adopt the arts and habits of civiliz It is, shall we keep our faith with them? can at least do that. We can, if we are disposed, maintain them in the possession of a country to which they were induced to emigrate by the most solemn assurances of the Government of the United States that it should

be to them and their children an inheritance forever. Well do I remember, Mr. President, the discussion up on this subject more than twenty years ago, alluded to by the learned and eloquent Senator from Massachusetts. (Mr. EVERETT,) and well do I remember also the doubts expressed by the more temperate of the opponents of the policy of Indian removal as to its results; and the taunts and jeers of the more violent who denounced it as an expedient invented to extricate the Administration from the difficulties and embarrassments brought upon it by the insatiate craving of the white man; and who insisted that the Indian would never realize the hope of that new land of promise held out to him as an inducement to emigrate; that the Indians would find no home, no resting place, never. I thought they were mistaken.

Before I leave this point of the subject, Mr. President, I must express the surprise with which I have been

must be known throughout the country, that the passage of this bill will affect very seriously the welfare of the Indian tribes within the bounds of the new Territories proposed to be organized; and every diligent inquirer must see that there is a question of public faith involved in the provisions of this bill in relation to the emigrant tribes west of Missouri. Several honorable Senators have spoken strongly and eloquently of the duty of observing sacredly and inviolably all the obligations attaching to a certain compact or understanding entered into many years ago between the two great sections of the standing as dishonorable. Yet when it is proposed to violate the public faith plighted to the feeble Indian tribes on the frontier, not a word is interested as the principle of panish and the principle of panish as the panis tribes on the frontier, not a word is interposed to save the honor of the country. We hear of no appeal to the sympathy or the justice of the country in their behalf. While the Senate chamber rings with stirring appeals upon the subject of the wrongs of the African, the wrongs of the Indian are passed by in silence! No memorials and other scruples or objections should yield. Upon such are presented in his behalf. Yet are not these Indians principles some of the most eminent men of the country Are they not our brethren of the human race, like the African? Are they not born with the same equality of rights, inalienable as those of the African or the white man?

Here, sir, I must be allowed a further digression. We have heard, in the course of this debate, allusion made to Wilberforce; the obloquy he incurred in high places, his triumph at last in the abolition of the slave trade and of slavery in the British colonies. The allusion, of course, suggests to us his fine accomplishments as a scholar, the excellence of his character as a man, and the brilliant fame conceded to him by the whole class of philanthropists and sentimentalists as their great leader. Well, sir, we doubtless have aspirants in this country to the fame achieved by Wilberforce; but I doubt, sir, whe ther they will ever attain the elevated rank in the scale of distinction to which Wilberforce and many of his supporters rose by their efforts for the suppression of the ave trade as well as the abolition of slavery in the British colonies. When the act for the abolition of slavery in the colonies was carried in the British Parliament in 1833, and the question of indemnity to the slaveholder came up, there was scarcely a dissenting voice raised against the propriety and justice of the proposition; and twenty millions of pounds sterling—one hundred millions of dollars—were promptly voted for that purpose. Whatever moral guilt, said the great leaders of the abolition movement, might attach to the slaveholder, the greatest share of the guilt and responsibility rested with the Government which encouraged and established slavery in the

But when, sir, have we ever heard from any one of our American Wilberforces, our professional philanthropists and slavery agitators, an avowal so liberal and just? When have any of them, in their fierce denunciations of slavery as a curse to the country and a stain upon the na-tional character, ever conceded the principle of indemnity as a just and necessary attendant of abolition? When has any one of them had the liberality and the manliness to declare that the guilt of slavery in the Unted States, whatever it might be, was justly chargeable to the mother country and to the colonies of the North as much as to those of the South? How strikingly greater the elevation of tone and sentiment, conspicuous in the leaders of abolition in Great Britain than in this country; how immeasurably elevated the one over the other in all that onstitutes true greatness and nobility of purpose!

While upon this subject I beg to refer to a remark made by the Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. SUMNER,) which now occurs to me as proper to be noticed. That gentleman told us that slavery in the South was destined to early extinction, because the conscience of the civilized world was against it. Sir, we have heard before now a similar announcement by another gentleman, made again and again. We were then told that slavery in the South doomed institution, and the South was solemnly warned to prepare for the fate which awaited it. We were then told that slavery must speedily disappear because the sentiment of the civilized world was against it. Now we are told that a more powerful agent than a mere sentiment is enlisted against slavery, and that it is under the irresistible power of the conscience of the civilized world that slavery in the South must yield. I wish to say a word or two as to the particular qualities and power of that conscience of the civilized world with which the slave institution of the South is threatened.

At this moment England and France, and perhaps other States of Western Europe, the very centre of civilization, are leagued together, and are buckling on their armor to uphold the Ottoman dominion, the most corrupt, oppressive, and debasing Government of the earth, and one which upholds slavery and the slave trade in its most odious and revolting forms; one founded on a social organization in which slavery is so deeply engrafted that it may be well doubted whether it could exist without it. The subjects of slavery in Turkey are not Africans only. It is a well-established fact that there is a regular trade between Constantinople and the eastern coast of the Black Sea in white slaves. Russia, when she conquered Georgia, abolished that infamous traffic within its limits; but those invincible champions of freedom, the Circassians, still tolerate the trade. Yet the conscience of Western Europe is so little affected by this and other enormities in the practice of the Turkish Government that they are not only ready to arm in its defence, but the proposition of European and Christian States.

The honorable Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sum NER) took occasion to state in his speech that slavery was rapidly disappearing in every other part of the world except the United States. The Sultan of Turkey, he says, has signified his displeasure at it; and, under the auspices of Great Britain, the Emperor of Morocco and the Beys of traordinary privileges, create a public debt, and do many funis and Tripoli have agreed to abolish the slave trade in their dominions. Well, sir, the Sultan has prohibited the slave market in Constantinople; but you have only to go a few miles out of the city to find a market both for white and black slaves, limited only by the means of purchasers. It is no doubt true also that the other Mohammedan States and dependencies of the Sublime Porte have promised to discourage or abolish the slave trade; but there does not exist the slightest evidence that the trade in their dominions is less active than formerly.

The truth is that the Turkish Government, for many cars past, has been at nurse to England and France, and great pains have been taken, especially by England, to dress her up for European exhibition and sympathy. The Grand Sultan has been prevailed upon to promulgate an organic law declaring perfect equality before the law beween all his subjects, Mussulman, Christian, and Jew; but in practice it is a dead letter.

Various other reforms have been announced with the same result; and except that in Constantinople, always under the eyes of the British and French ambassadors, there is more security against insult and oppression to the Christian, less of the ferocious and sanguinary passions prevalent than formerly; a less frequent use of the bow-string, the scimetar, and the sack; there has been no substantial improvement. All the vital elements of government and society, all the practices of the pachas and other ubordinate functionaries throughout the provinces, exhibit the same rottenness at bottom, the same corrupt, opressive, and debasing influences. Now, sir, no intelligent man in Europe supposes that

he independence of the western States of that continent will be in any danger from the conquest of Constantinople by Russia; and as to any material derangement of an exsting balance of power, founded upon any principle of equality, as between the different States of Europe, which the success of Russia may occasion, we know that there exists no such balance of power. Yet these are the pretexts for the interference of Great Britain and France in behalf of Turkey. But, sir, Louis Napoleon needs a war that is popular with France. He has also his ambitious projects, which might be thwarted if Russia should enlarge her resources by the acquisition of any part of Turkey; and the colossal empire of England in India may be in ome danger at a future period if the Czar should succeed in his present projects. Hence it is that we find a war with Russia has become popular in Great Britain; and not a single remonstrance is heard from the philanthropists and abolitionists against the policy of maintaining the power and independence of the Ottoman Empire ground that it upholds slavery and the slave trade.

Sir, I do not mean to make myself the partisan of Russia by any thing I have said upon this subject; nor do I mean to disparage the proper conscience of Western Eu-rope; but what I do mean is to show that this conscience f the civilized world, spoken of by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, and especially the conscience of the philanthropists and abolitionists of England, is an essentially practical and conservative guide of conduct when-ever any great question is pending which concerns the preservation of British power and supremacy. I do not find fault with them or their conscience; I rather respect them more. Yes, sir, the British Wilberforces of the present day, without renouncing their anti-slavery princi ples or discarding their conscience, hold both subordinate to the great interests of the British empire. While, they continue to extend their patronising hand to the leaders of slavery agitation in the United States, their patriotism forbids them to distract the councils of their own country by their agitations and remonstrances. could wish, sir, that their example could be imitated in

this country A word to my friend (Mr. WADE) who sits by my side. He was very severe the other day upon the slaveholders of the South, characterizing them as aristocrats. Let me say to him that, having made that speech, if he will visit England, he will find himself quite a lion with the proudest aristocracy of the world. I will venture to say that he will be taken by the hand by my lord the Earl of Carlisle, who would doubtless insist upon having the honor

of presenting him at Court.
Mr. WADE. I want no such henor myself.

well consider it one of those cases of overpowering necessity and interest to the country to which all constitutional principles some of the most eminent men of the country have heretofore felt themselves justified in acting. I therefore take no exception to the course of any of my Southern friends upon this subject, believing, as they no doubt do, that it is a measure of all the importance which they ascribe to it. It was in view of the overruling neand I have heard it suggested that it was upon similar of the United States was strongly questioned at the time principles that some of the members of Mr. Monroe's Ca- of the adoption of the measure; and, looking at the quesupon this subject in my place in the Senate before I yield my objections to this bill. I propose, sir, to discuss the question with candor and fairness; to give to all the argnents in its favor their due weight and importance, all then to consider whether they make out a case of over-

ought to surrender my objectious to the measure.

Sir, much time has been consumed, and there has been a great deal of ingenuity displayed, in the discussion of points and questions of subordinate importance. The friends of the bill differ widely among themselves as to some of the doctrines and principles involved in the general subject. These differences have led to inquiries as to the source of the power heretofore exercised by Congress in legislating for the Torritoide. gress in legislating for the Territotics-some deriving it from the express grant of the power to make all needful rules and regulations for the disposition of or respecting the public domain; and others mantain that it results necessarily from the political soveeignty of the United States over all territory as soon as lequired or annexed; while some admit the power of th United States to legislate for the inhabitants of the 'erritories on all subdeny its power to legislate upon theparticular subject of slavery, as being inconsistent with the equal rights of the citizens of all the States secured ly he Constitution. A greater number of the friends of he bill adopt a broader principle as the foundation of thepolicy of non-intervention by Congress upon the slave qustion in the Territories. Going back to the principe of the Revolution. they deny that Congress has any right to legislate for, or in any manner to interfere with, thinternal affairs or institutions of the inhabitants of a brritory. They conis the principle of popular sovereigty, or the right of self-government, extended to the peple of the Territories, and it is the principle upon wich the bill under consideration is based. If well-foundd, it seems to preclude Congress from organizing a government for them in any form, or of imposing any restriction or qualifications upon the absolute right of the inhabitans, natives or foreigners, to govern themselves under suc organic laws as they shall think best. The suggestion of this principle, of the right of the people of the Territoies, has given

rise to a variety of incidental questions.

It seems to be admitted by some of the adocates of this principle that Congress may legislate for the protection of the inhabitants of a Territory by organizing a government for them, and that then the power of Congress general supervisory control over Territorial legislation, but are willing to concede the exclusive right to establish such domestic institutions as they think proper. The honorable Senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass) himself admits the difficulty of determining the precise point at | ed never acquiesced in it. which all legislation by Congress relating to the Territories shall cease; and the inquiry as to whether any number of inhabitants, however small, may be safely allowed to settle all questions of internal policy is evidently one of great embarrasment. The distinguished Senator from Michigan regards these and other like points as questions for practical solution by Congress, in the exercise of common sense and a sound discretion. As to the questions which have been mooted in relation to the source, or grant in the Constitution, from which is derived any power in Congress to legislate for the Territories at all, the best answer undoubtedly is, that Congress has exercised the power in various forms, from the foundation of the Government, stitutionality of the purchase and annexation of the vhole other things which may be greatly injurious to the wel-fare of the future State to which the Territorial government may give place; but we must take the risk of unwise comes highly expedient and necessary to the general welfare of the country to do so. Those who hold to the doctrine of the inherent right of self-government in the inhabitants will find no difficulty, of course, in applying the principle of non-intervention to the Territories. I leave it to the friends of the bill to inquire whether its provisions, as it now stands, are not, in some respects,

aconsistent with the principle upon which it is based.

If this measure shall appear to be as important to the nterests of the country as its friends assume, I shall feel no embarrassment, arising from any of the questions to which I have just alluded, in giving my support to the principle of non-intervention embraced in the provisions of the bill before the Senate. I think it is a wise and expedient principle for general application; and upon this point it will be perceived that there is no difference between myself and any of my Southern friends. It is not a new principle. It was the principle adopted in the compromise acts of 1850, and had my full concurrence and support. But in the application of this principle to the erritories proposed to be organized by this bill, in order to give it a free and unembarrassed operation, it is proposed to repeal the Missouri compromise; and thus a great practical question is directly presented, and one which, above all others, claims the dispassionate reflection and consideration of every Senator and every states-man of the country, North or South. Is it wise, is it expedient to disturb the Missouri compromise? Does the repeal of the slavery restriction clause of the act of 1820 promise such important and beneficent results to the country that all objections should be yielded?

It is contended with great earnestness by the friends of this measure that it does give such promise; and the highest talents and ability of the Senate have been arrayed to prove that there was nothing in the circumstance under which the Missouri compromise was adopted, or in the subsequent history of the country connected with it, which can be objected to its repeal. I propose to notice briefly and fairly all the points suggested or assumed in the arguments of the friends of this measure; and I think, sir, that, before a dispassionate and uncommitted Senate, I could throw out some suggestions which might lead onorable Senators to doubt the correctness of some of

result from any thing I can now say.

Sir, it is contended that, by applying the principle of non-intervention to the Territories, we shall harmonize the action of the Government by conforming it to the principle of the compromise acts of 1850. A It is said that the slavery restriction clause of the act of 1820 was a violation of the obligations of the treaty by which France ceded to the United States the Territory of Louisiana. I admit it. It is contended that the restriction upon slavery imposed by the Missouri confpromise was unjust to the South. That is also true.

The attempt of the North in 1820 to interdict slavery in Missouri, as a condition of her admission into the Union, and the continued resistance offered to the application of that State for admission, until the South agreed to accept the proposition to interdict slavery in all the remaining territory ceded by France lying north of the line of 36° 30', was just such a proceeding that the great names invoked by the honorable Senator frem Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) to sustain him in his course as an abolitionist, Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and Hamilton, had they been living at the time, anti-slavery in sentiment though they were, would have raised their united voices against it, as conceived in a spirit the very reverse of that which controlled their own course when they gave their sanction to the Constitution; when they contributed the full weight of their great names and characters in conciliating and recouciling the strongest antagonisms of sentiment and interests between the North and the South, and in blending all in one great organic instrument of union, unparalleled in the wisdom of its provisions and the grandeur of its results. Jefferson did raise his voice against it, but unhappily his glorious compatriots of the

was so longer able to control the say in the would see that aristocrats, after all, are not so bad a class as he supposed.

Mr. President, I now approach the consideration of another provision in this bill, which, in the opinion of many, possesses an importance paramount to all others; one that is held to be so important to the welfare of the country, and especially to the South, that some of my Southern friends have expressed the opinion, in our private and friendly conferences, that a Southern man who was no longer able to control the control the day.

It tuits the purposes of the professional philanthropists and igitators of the North to represent the celebrated anticlavery extention movement in 1820 as founded exclusively on principles of humanity and opposition to the institution of slavery in the South. Nothing could be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should fail to support it would be considered a traitor to should be considered as traitor to should be considered a traitor to should be considered as traitor the interests of the South; and that, under such circumstances, I should waive all scruples about the violation of fourdation of a lasting feud between the North and the South. There were other considerations which impelled then, of a very different nature and quite as repugnant to their feelings as slavery. These were the long-con-tinued and apparently never-ending sway of the Virrated in this bill will produce the happy consequences giaia dynasty, and the perpetual exclusion from power which its more ardent supporters contend it will, though it may be a nice question in casuistry, a Senator might that period seemed to threaten them. Urged by these strong passions, they had no difficulty, through the press and the pulpit, to rouse into activity the whole latent yet powerful anti-slavery feeling in the North. It was a great party and political movement; and the anti-slavery sentiment, so universal at the North, was the chief ele-

ment of its success. It is further urged by the friends of this bill that Congress had no constitutional power to enact the Missouri compromise, and therefore they contend it ought to be repealed. The power of Congress to impose a perpetual restriction upon slavery over any portion of the territory of the United States was strongly questioned at the time binet proceeded when they gave their opinions in favor of the constitutional construction, I agree with the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise act; but I wish to hold some converse with my Southern friend duced from any grant in the constitution. Yet it was duced from any grant in the constitution. Yet it was accepted by the South, and asquiesced in as a measure of compromise between the North and the South, and its of those gentlemen, no more fatal blow to their present constitutionality was sanctioned by President Monroe prospects could be given, than to reject this bill. But I constitutionality was sanctioned by President Monroe and his Cabinet.

Again: it has been alleged that the Missouri comproruling necessity; a case of such vital importance to te country generally, or to the South particularly, that I so sacred a character that to repeal it would be a breach though anti-slavery in their sentiments, have never apof good faith on the part of the South, has been repuen diated by the North itself; and that the North has never acquiesced in it as a settlement or concession of the right of the South to introduce slavery into the territory south of 36° 30'. That the North, in 1850, opposed the extension of the Missouri compromise line, as established in 1820, to the Pacific, over any part of the territory ac-quired from Mexico, is true. It has also been urged, in the course of the debate, that the North opposed the admission of Arkansas, lying south of the line of 36° 30', into the Union, on the ground that slavery was recognised in its constitution; but I believe it has been suc cessfully shown that no such opposition was made. But, sir, it is true that the Missouri compromise has been repudiated, and has never been acquiesced in as a valid compact by a class of citizens at the North, made up of | zens? iects of legitimate and ordinary legislative control, yet abolitionists proper and the more mischievous type of anti-slavery agitators which is found represented on this but the suggestions of timidity; that a better feeling and floor. They repudiate all compromises—the compromise of 1820 and 1850 alike. Their hostility to the institution of slavery in the South is uncompromising. The Senator from Ohio (Mr. Chase) and the Senator from valence of a more liberal feeling towards Southern institu-Massachusetts (Mr. Sumen) have boldly proclaimed the | tions can be relied upon as furnishing any assurance that principles which will control their course upon this sub- no future manifestation of their anti-slavery sentiments ject. The Senator from Ohio avows the purpose to agitate the question until slavery shall be abolished in the people of the North imbibed their anti-slavery sentiments District tend that it belongs to them as an iherent right. This control of Congress. They admit that slavery where it is the principle of popular sovereigty, or the right of exists in the States they cannot reach through Congress; schools; they have had them confirmed in the lecturebut they give no pledge that when it is abolished in this District they will cease their agitation; nor will they. day. Though they profess to make no war upon the constitu-tion, yet such is their concern for freedom and free labor, and their hostility to slavery and slave labor, that if in their efforts to vindicate the rights of the one and abo- promptly and with what effect it may be brought to exlish the other the Union should perish, they would be sufficiently consoled for the ruin they had brought upon the country by the reflection that they had been true to the principles they professed.

Do what you may, or forbear to do what you may now, these gentlemen are the inexorable foes of the institutions of the South. They not only repudiate the compromises ment for them, and that then the power of Congress of 1820 and 1850, but the compromises of that greater ceases. Others contend that Congress should retain a compact for the settlement of all conflicting sentiments and interests between the North and the South-the Constitution. I admit, then, that the North has opposed the extension of the line of 36° 30' to the Pacific; and that the class of agitators in the North to whom I have allud-

Some of the friends of this bill have denied that the slavery restriction clause of the act of 1820 was any part of the Missouri compromise. They assert that this clause of the act of 1820 was not acquiesced in by the North as and a false philanthropy. Admit them to be nothing a settlement of the question; that the admission of Mismore than prejudices; are they, therefore, to be disresouri into the Union was still opposed by the North in 1821, on the ground that the constitution formed and presented by the people of Missouri, under the act of 1820, prohibited the Legislature from passing any law authorizing mulattoes or other free persons of color to emi-grate to the State; and it is contended that the admission of Missouri into the Union was the result of a compro mise of that question; and that is now contended by gen tlemen to have been the real Missouri compromise.

and that the power has been found both safe and convenient. It would not be safe, at this day, to look too closely into the question of the power of Congress over true; but the inference drawn from that fact by the very Mr. B is gravely considered whether what they now call the Ottoman Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal into the
man Empire should not be received as a co-equal i clause of the act of 1820 had nothing to do with the ques-

the judgment of the country.

Having thus gone over all the grounds of objection suggested against the validity of the Missouri compromise, I trust it will be seen that I am not disposed to controvert them either as to fact or doctrine, with such exceptions legislation in the Territories. if, from any cause it be, only as upon more deliberate consideration, by those who serted them, will be allowed to be well taken.

But, sir, admitting them, with the exceptions I have stated, to be incontrovertibly true, still the tion remains to be considered and decided: Do these facts and doctrines demonstrate the expediency of disturbing the Missouri compromise under existing circumstances and in coming to an affirmative conclusion upon this ques-

tion? I hesitate, I pause.
I have listened with attention to all the luminous expositions of theories of constitutional construction and of popular sovereignty; to the ingenious application of doctrinal points to questions of compacts and compromises by the friends of this measure. The question has been ruitful of themes for dialectic display, for the exhibition of great powers of analysis and logical acumen : but ble argument has been singularly defective and unsatisfactory upon the main question, What practical advantage or benefit to the country generally, or to the South in particular, will the repeal of the Missouri compromise secure?

It is asserted with great confidence that the application of the principle of non-intervention to these Territo- sert-that but one slave State could, under any circum ries and the repeal of the Missouri compromise will have the effect to transfer to the local legislatures, the Territories and States, and to relieve Congress for the future from the most dangerous and distracting subject of con-troversy which ever has or ever can disturb its deliberation; that the source of those sectional conflicts and agitations upon the subject of slavery, which have more than | will become a slave State? once threatened the peace of the country, will be removed; that justice will be done to the South; that the Constitution will be restored and vindicated; and a new guaranty be provided for the stability of the Union. I ed. A few gentlemen with whom I have conversed think sults predicated of this measure can be shown to follow as | concur in Congress, others in ecstacies with the prospect of a simithe conclusions to which they have come; but, after the lar recognition of some favorite notion or doctrine of convote of last night, I can have but little hope of such a stitutional interpretation, after expending the whole force stitutional interpretation, after expending the whole force of their great ability in elucidating their respective creeds, forthwith jump to the conclusion that the happiest results will necessarily and inevitably follow the

option of this measure. Upon what rational calculation do gentlemen assume that they can establish, upon a firm foundation, any one of the favorite principles or doctrines incorporated in this controversy the principle of non-intervention by a vote of this Congress which the next or any subsequent Congress a question of constitutional power, or rule of constitupassions connected with these questions are necessarily political; and liable to change and vibrate with the changing interests and composition of parties? Congress, by its votes, has often reversed the decisions of the judicial judicial epartment of the Government on questions of constituional power and construction, and still oftener its own ons. In the very nature of things, no such stability as is argued can be given to any principle which this Congress may sanction by its vote on this bill.

If this be so, how can this measure furnish any new guarantee for the preservation of the Union? Or how transfer to the Territories and take away from Congress those distracting and sectional questions which so often intrude themselves here? And, above all, how will the passage of this bill remove the source of those slavery

Mr. President, take the provisions of the bill as it stands amended, and suppose the inhabitants, less or more in number, of one of these Territories, as soon as

their Government is organized, should establish slavery by law, would that quiet agitation in the North? Or would it not be more rational to conclude that it would be a sounding of the toesin for a general rally of all the worst elements of the abolition faction at the North, stimulated and supported by great numbers of Northern citizens who have heretofore given no countenance to their excesses? Would not a more widely-diffused and a more intense anti-slavery sentiment be awakened than has ever existed at any former period; prepared and determined, when the proper time should come, to resist the application of the new slave State to be admitted into the

But let us now suppose that slavery shall not be introduced into either of these Territories under the sanction of a Territorial law-and it is the general opinion of those who have spoken in this debate that it will not-will agitation then cease? Is there no ground to apprehend that the impression produced by the repeal of the Missouri compromise upon the people of the North will settle down into a more decided and deep-rooted hostility to slavery and the whole South than could, under any other circumstances likely to occur in future, be provoked? I speak not of that class of Northern citizens to which the Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. SUMNER, and the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Chass,) and their followers belong, professional agitators, who avow their purpose of continued agitation; and, whether this bill passes or not, they will do their utmost to fan the fires of fanaticism and inflame every anti-Southern feeling and prejudice in the North. And let me say that nothing we could do would more painfully disturb the present composure was speaking of the probable effect of the passage of this bill upon a far different class of Northern citizens. I allude proved the fanatical ravings and mischievous machin tions of the various abolition societies and sects, who have had no disposition to disturb or evade any of the compromises or guaranties of the Constitution for the protection of the rights of the slaveholder; but who may yet entertain feelings of decided hostility to the introduc-tion of slavery into any Territories heretofore considered free territory. Is there no just ground to apprehend that the repeal of the Missouri compromise, which, whether constitutional or not, for more than thirty years bas been regarded in the North as a valid settlement of a line north of which slavery could never go; I repeat, is there no danger to be apprehended that the repeal of that settlement will impart a stronger and deeper complexion to the anti-slavery sentiment of this class of Northern citi-

I know it has been said that all such apprehensions are more liberal sentiments toward the South and Southern institutions begin to prevail at the North than formerly. of Columbia, and everywhere else within the in early life-in the period of their infancy, at the doroom, in the church, and by the popular literature of the A sentiment thus deeply implanted in the hearts of a whole population, though it may be ordinarily quiet, and seldom break forth into fierce agitation, yet we have seen, in the history of the Missouri compromise, how ercise its influence on occasion. Louisiana had been admitted as a slave State in 1812, Mississippi in 1817, and Alabama in 1819, without opposition; and all the while scarcely a consciousness seemed to pervade the country that there was any diversity of institution or sentiment in the North and in the South which could give rise to any serious controversy; but in 1820, when Missouri applied for admission into the Union, suddenly the whole North rose at the summons of their political leaders and protested against it.

Sir, I believe there is a better feeling prevailing at the North towards the South than formerly; but would it not be wise on the part of the South to do nothing to reverse the current of that better feeling, unless urged by some great necessity in vindication of its rights?

But it is said that these anti-slavery feelings at the North are nothing more than the prejudices of education garded by statesmen who have the control of the affairs regard for public prejudices of any kind; and whatever measure appeared to him to be right and proper in itself he would insist upon, though it might excite the opposiinsist upon, though it might excite the opposition and inflame the passions of the whole country.

Mr. PETTIT. He was right, and he ought to have

Mr. BELL. I cannot agree with the Senator; but I out of this chamber, especially when these prejudices territory ceded to the United States by France. Great ition of the admission of Missouri into the Union, or, in other may arise from the concession of the principle of the inherentright of self-government in the people of a Territory. Having the uncontrolled power of legisfying those prejudices. I know it may be said that this is precisely such a case as I have here presented. A great as that, I would have been prepared to give it my cordial wrong, it is alleged, has been done to the South by the Missouri compromise, and chance has presented the portunity for redress; and this brings up fairly the inquiry whether the passage of this bill is of such impor-tance to the interests of the South that every Southern Senator should support it, whatever scruples he may have in relation to some of its provisions? What has the South to gain by the adoption of this measure? Will South to gain by the adoption of this measure: win the passage of this bill redress any wrong or injustice heretofore done by the North to the South? I have already admitted that injustice was done to the South by the Missouri compromise; but, after all, what was the extent of that injustice? I take it for granted that there extent of that injustice? I take it for granted that there are no stated those laws which in is not a man who has ever considered those laws which in this country control the geographical extension or diffusion of slavery who will pretend that if the Missouri compromise act had never been passed slavery would have gone north of the northern boundary of Missouri. Then the whole extent of the wrong done the South by that measure was to prohibit slavery between that boundary and the line of 36° 30'; and not even to that extent, unless it shall turn out that this intermediate territory is adapted to slave labor. In this intermediate territory all will agree that such is the character of the country g rally-so large a portion of it consisting of sterile destances, be formed within its limits. Now, this being the extent of the wrong done the South by the Missouri com-promise, will this bill, if it shall pass, redress it? Will slavery be established in the Kansas Territory proposed to be organized under its provisions? Does any has fully considered the subject believe that this Territory

I have inquired with some diligence into the grounds upon which any expectation which may exist in the South that slavery will be established in this Territory is foundneed not say that if one half of the many beneficent re- that it may, but the greater number, with more reason, the opinion that it never will. A few house a probable consequence of its adoption, I would no longer | hold and other slaves may be taken into the Territory of hesitate to give it my support; but, unfortunately, the Kansas, if this bill shall pass, for the convenience of their argument has proceeded no further than the affirmation, without showing how these results must or will fol-low. Some gentlemen, delighted at the prospect of see-rized. But, as the Territory does not revert to the coning a favorite theory of the right of the inhabitants of a dition of slave territory by the provisions of this bill, Territory to govern themselves recognised by a vote of few will take that risk. The great uncertainty as to

Kansas, if this bill shall pass, for the convenience of their labor in opening and preparing for cultivation new farms, and with a vague expectation that slavery may be authorized. But, as the Territory does not revert to the condition of slave territory by the provisions of this bill, few will take that risk. The great uncertainty as to what the sentiment of the majority of the settlers on the question of slavery or no slavery will be, or rather the probability that slavery will be prohibited, will deter every prudent slaveholder from emigrating to the Territory with his slaves; especially as they will see that the strongest tide of immigration will flow in from the North and from abroad, bringing with them all their anti-slavery prejudices.

Again: the slaveholder will know that, should the Territorial Legislature sanction sinvery, yet that the order of admission into the Bnion as a State will still have to be passed before he will feel secure in his property. The example of Missouri would be before him. Besides, there will be no great inducement in the location or character of the soil to take slaves there. The principal settlements will be upon the best lands, and those will be found upon or near the great lines of immigration to California and Oregon; and the most profitable and marketable products will be just such as can be grown more cheaply by free labor—breadstuffs and live stock. I am informed that many of the slaveholders of Missouri re now seeking a more genial clime, and a soil better adapted to slave labor, in the broad and rich domain of Texas; and it will not be long after Kansas shall become a free State that Missouri, bounded on three sides by free States, will not be long after Kansas shall become a free State that Missouri, bounded on three sides by free States, will not be long after Kansas shall become a free State that Missouri, bounded on three sides by free States, will not be long after Kansas shall become a free State that Missouri, bounded on three sides by free States, will not be bill, and especially when they consider, as they ought, the inherent element of disturbance which exists in the be passed before he will feel secure in his property. The example of Missouri would be before him. Besides, there may anul? How restore a violated Constitution, settle | will be upon the best lands, and those will be found upon mal construction, when so many of the interests and Oregon; and the most profitable and marketable products not be long after Kansas shall become a free State that Missouri, bounded on three sides by free States, will cease to be a slave State. And this, sir, will most probably be the measure of the redress which the South will derive from this bill for any wrong or injustice done it by the Missouri comprehense.

the Missouri compromise.

But it is earnestly insisted that the principle of nonintervention proposed to be established by this bill will be of the greatest value and importance to the South, whether slavery shall be authorized in these Territories passage of this bill remove the source of those slavery agitations at the North which have heretofore, upon two or not; it will secure the just rights of the South in all memorable occasions, filled the country with alarm for time to come. I have already shown that you can estabmemorable occasions, filled the country with alarm for time to come. I have already shown that you can establish safety of the Union? Is there no danger that, in-

gagements of the Government with the Indians shall be struck by one circumstance attending the pendency of . Mr. BELL. I only mean to say that I think my friend Revolution had passed away, and he, in his retirement, stead of stanching, you will open afresh "this bleeding assume that the vote which may be given on the passage faithfully and rigidly observed, when the whole scope and this measure before Congress. It is known here, and it would see that aristocrats, after all, are not so bad a class | was so longer able to control the active passions of the of this bill, giving the sanction of Congress to the principle of non-intervention, shall stand unrepealed, and become the established doctrine of the country; still the question recurs, of what practical value will it be to the question recurs, of what practical value will it be to the South? Does any Southern man suppose that slavery will ever go into any of the Territories which, at any future time, may be carved out of the large extent of country included within the bounds of the Nebraska Territory as proposed to be organized by this bill? I take it for granted that no such idea is entertained by any one. Where is the other and remaining territory of the United States to which this reliable of the country of the United States. to which this principle of non-intervention can be made available or of any value to the South! The territory west of Arkaneas will be more irrevocably dedicated to the exclusive possession of the Indians, and more effec-tually barred against the formation of a new slave State under the operation of this bill than heretofore; for it will be the last and only retreat of the emigrant and other tribes power in the control of the emigrant and other tribes now in the territory west of Missouri. Utah and New Mexico are already organized Territories according to the principle of non-intervention. The right to form new slave States out of the ample territory of Texas is guarantied by a compact far safer and stronger than eny which Congress can furnish by giving its sanction to this measure.

this measure.

There is a little spot of hopelessly barren country of some few thousand square miles in extent, ceded to the United States by Texas, under a provision of the compromise acts of 1850, to which this principle of non-intervention, if established, may be applied, if it can be safely done without violating the compact under which Texas came into the Union, and that is all! And is it for this poor boon—if my friends will allow the expression, this phantom—that we are called upon to sanction a measure phon boon—If my friends will allow the expression, the phantom—that we are called upon to sanction a measure which will impart new life and vigor, arm with new heads and fangs, the now half-conquered hydra of the North? Is it for this that we are called upon to give promise of a better day to those political agitators at the North who have staked their whole fortunes and hopes of power upon the successful formation of a great Northern and sectional party, the last and most fatal evil that can befall the country; for its consummation will be the de-struction of the Constitution and the extinction of public liberty? Is it for this that we are called upon to supply new weapons of warfare to all the enemies of the South. and to invite a combination of Whig, Free-soilers, Soft-Shell and Independent Democrats, Liberty men, Aboli-tionists, Socialists, and Atheists, founded upon no common principle but hostility to the South, no common ob-

ject but the acquisition of power and the spoils?

But, Mr. President, it is said that we may make acquisitions of territory hereafter, perhaps from Mexico, and that then the South will have the benefit of the principle. of non-intervention recognised in this bill. I fear, sir, that this too will prove a phantom; but if ever any such acquisition of new territory shall be made, and I hope the date of such acquisitions will be far in the future, I trust it will be under the influence of some great national and patriotic impulse, prompted by considerations of a common interest, and a policy which knows no North, no South; and these will furnish far stronger guarantees of the rights of the South in any such acquisitions than any vote of Congress in favor of this measure. But if it be deemed of any the slightest investment. deemed of any the slightest importance to any future in-terest of the South that the sentiment of this Congress shall be expressed in favor of the principle of non-intervention, why not bring forward a joint resolution decla-

ratory of the principle? I have already said that there is no difference between myself and my Southern friends in relation to this princi-ple. I will vote for such a resolution most cheerfully. I have said already, and I repeat, that if I could take the view of the importance of this measure to the country which my Southern friends do, cutting off the source of all future controversy between the North and the South putting an end to agitation in both sections upon the subject of slavery, I would feel justified in waiving all my objections to this bill and in uniting heartily with them in its support. We differ only as to the results of the measure.

Sir, a reason has been urged why every Southern Sena-tor should support this bill which I have not yet noticed. A great, truly national, and patriotic party, it is suggested, is now in the ascendency at the North, which makes a voluntary tender of the principle of non-intervention to the acceptance of the South, to be a rule by which all questions relating to slavery in the Territories may hereafter be settled; and it is insisted that a sense of grati-tude, if nothing else, should rally the whole South in its support. I asknowledge the obligation for their generous intentions; but, unless some more certain and substantial benefit can be derived from the provisions of this bill than I can detect, I think our gratitude to those gentlemen of the North who have stood so generously and boldly by the South in sustaining the compromise acts of 1850, as well as those who are now prepared to sustain the provisions of this bill, will be best shown by accepting noof a great country in their hands? An eminent British statesman—I do not now remember who—once said of a contemporary that but for one defect he would be the greatest statesman of the times; that was, that he had no gies may be required in sustaining measures and in-terests of the greatest practical advantage to the whole country.
I have heard it suggested by Southern gentlemen

that we may want Cuba. Ah! sir, Cuba. Had this troubling of the bitter waters of sectional strife been a movement, not for the acquisition of Cuba by conquest, but for the preservation of Cuba as she is; had tervention against the intermeddling policy of Great Britain and France in the affairs of that beautiful island, and to preserve it against the fate to which it seems to be verging, that of becoming a semi-barbarous Power, a second Hayti, just upon our Southern borders : Irepeat, had this been a movement to prevent such a catastrophe support.

Mr. President, unless all the signs of the times are deceptive, we are, at this moment, on the eve of great events. A war between the great Powers of Europe seems to be inevitable; and a general convulsion of the Old World seems not improbable. In either event, none but the Omniscient Ruler of all things can know how we are to escape the general calamity: or how soon we may be forced, in vindication of our national rights, to become parties to the general strife. But if the existing crisis in the affairs of Europe should pass without a war, it requires no great sagacity to perceive that we have no assurance that Great Britain and France, whose policy in setting bounds to the further growth and expansion of this great country has already been indicated, will not be further developed by proceedings on their part which can no longer be patiently submitted to. It is for this reason, among others, that I so deeply

regret the recurrence of any cause for the renewal of those fierce sectional controversies which tend so much to distract the national councils and impair the national energies. The North and the South united, and cordial in the vindication of a national quarrel, this country has nothing to fear from any conflict with foreign Powers,

nothing to fear from any conflict with foreign Fowers, come when it may.

Mr. President, I had proposed, if I had strength, to say something more on the subject of this dangerous element of national discord—slavery agitation. I should like, if I had strength, to speak of the true method of chaining down this dragon which besets our path, and interposes a barrier to the development of a civilization which might finally bring all the world to admire and imitate it; but, sir, I have not, and must take my seat.

THE SINKING OF THE STEAMER J. L. AVERY .- The Cincinnati Commercial has some additional particulars of the sinking of the J. L. Avery, forty-five miles below Natchez. Among the lost were ten slaves belonging to Wm. J. and John Purnell, of Worcester county, Maryland. Among the saved are Wm. J. Purnell, wife and five slaves; E. Purnell, and Thomas P. Single or Tingle, all of Maryland. The Commercial says:

persons were drowned altogether. He remained by the wreck several days and aved what he could of the passengers, baggage, furniture, &c. The boat was sunk by a snag, which came through the bottom.

not such a great diffrence after all .- Boston Post.